



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/330,154	06/11/1999	SUSUMU GOTO	862.2866	9061

5514 7590 01/27/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

VANORE, DAVID A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2881

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/330,154

Applicant(s)

GOTO, SUSUMU

Examiner

David A Vanore

Art Unit

2881

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 June 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Note: See attachment at end of Office Action for details regarding recent changes to 35 USC 102 (e).

Claims 1-11, 15-25, and 29-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Terashima et al.

Terashima et al. teaches the following :

A charged particle source (Fig. 19 Item IL), an irradiation system for producing an arcuate shaped beam and irradiating said beam onto a mask (Fig. 19 Item IL), a projection optical system comprising a plurality of magnets (Fig. 19 Item 1008, 1010, and 1013), an acquisition means (Fig. 25 Item 1040) which determines image information for correction (Col. 21 Lines 38-61), and a controller to control the currents distributed to the magnets (Fig. 14 Item 40) as recited in claims 1-8, 15-25, and 29-40, where the control system and projection optical system is controlled by the control means to adjust the optical characteristics of the beam and to correct any aberrations in the beams (Col. 13 Lines 35-45 and Col. 20 Line 32-59).

Art Unit: 2881

An acquisition system which comprises a mask (Fig. 25 Item 1006) which passes a predetermined beam portion and a measurement system which correlates the position of the wafer (Fig. 25 item 1016) and the mask to determine the and correct a pattern image projected on the wafer (Col. 21 Lines 38-61) as recited in claims 9-11.

Regarding the newly added feature in claim 35 of a moving amount of the second principal plane is equal to a value obtained by multiplying a moving amount of the first principal plane by a magnification of a projection optical system while a moving direction of the first principal plane is the opposite direction to that of the second principal plane is not taught by Terashima et al. However, this feature was not claimed previously.

Regardless, this is the intended use of an apparatus having the configuration of Terashima et al. and furthermore is an inherent feature of any optical system where a first optical system produces an object plane downstream of another magnifying system. In Terashima et al. for instance, the image produced downstream of reduction optical system 108 at or after lens 113 will move in accordance with a change in the settings of lenses 108a and 108b, necessarily. However, the motion of the image produced at or beyond lens 119 is multiplied by any magnification factor imparted by lens 113.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2881

Claims 12-13 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima et al. in view of Sakamoto et al.

Regarding claims 12-13, and 26-27, Terashima et al. teaches all limitations as applied above but fails to teach an acquisition system with a substrate having a mark, a measurement unit to detect backscattered electrons, and a substrate stage which moves such that the position of the mark moves across the position where the charged particle beam becomes incident on the substrate stage.

Sakamoto et al. teaches a charged particle lithography apparatus comprising a mark (15, 17) composed of heavy metal (Col. 10 Lines 39-68), a backscattered electron detector, and a scanning stage which scans the position of the mark and determines the incident position of the charge particle beam by correlating the detected backscattered electrons with the stage position (Col. 5 Lines 30-44).

Sakamoto et al. modifies Terashima et al. to produce a charged particle lithography device with a backscattered electron detection and aligning means.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a backscattered electron detection and aligning means because Sakamoto et al. demonstrates that the incorporation of such a means in a charged particle lithography device is well known in the art.

Claims 14 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima et al. and Sakamoto et al. as applied above, and in further view of Mori et al.

Art Unit: 2881

Terashima et al. and Sakamoto et al. teach all limitations as applied above but fail to teach marks on a substrate shaped as a crisscross or composed of a heavy metal.

Mori et al. teaches a charged particle lithography apparatus comprising alignment marks (M1) in the shape of a crisscross and composed of heavy metal.

Mori et al. modifies Terashima et al. and Sakamoto et al. to produce a charged particle lithography apparatus having alignment marks on a wafer in the shape of a crisscross and composed of a heavy metal.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide alignment marks in the shape of a crisscross and composed of heavy metal on a substrate in a charged particle lithography apparatus because Mori et al. teaches that such a modification provides the necessary accurate alignment between a mask and semiconductor wafer (Col. 1 Lines 7-12).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 18, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Terashima et al. fails to teach the changing of currents to magnetic lenses to correct image distortion, a controller arranged to control currents to magnetic lenses to adjust image distortion, and that a moving amount of the second principal plane is equal to a value obtained by multiplying a moving amount of the first principal plane by a magnification of a projection optical system while a moving direction of the first principal plane is the opposite direction to that of the second principal plane.

Terashima et al. teaches the control of currents to magnetic lenses and a controller arranged to adjust the value of currents supplied to magnetic lenses in reduction optical system 108 articulated by control circuit 313 via magnification control circuit 307 (Col. 9 Lines 4-14).

Applicant's argue that the recited feature of a moving amount of the second principal plane is equal to a value obtained by multiplying a moving amount of the first principal plane by a magnification of a projection optical system while a moving direction of the first principal plane is the opposite direction to that of the second principal plane is not taught by Terashima et al. However, this feature was not claimed previously. Regardless, this is the intended use of an apparatus having the configuration of Terashima et al. and furthermore is an inherent feature of any optical system where a first optical system produces an object plane downstream of another magnifying system. In Terashima et al. for instance, the image produced downstream of reduction optical system 108 at or after lens 113 will move in accordance with a change in the settings of lenses 108a and 108b, necessarily. However, the motion of the image produced at or beyond lens 119 is multiplied by any magnification factor imparted by lens 113.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2881

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A Vanore whose telephone number is 703-306-0246. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Lee can be reached on 703-308-4116. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

dav
January 15, 2003


JOHN R. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Recent Statutory Changes to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

On November 2, 2002, President Bush signed the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (H.R. 2215) (Pub. L. 107-273, 116 Stat. 1758 (2002)), which further amended 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) (Pub. L. 106-113, 113 Stat. 1501 (1999)). The revised provisions in 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are completely retroactive and effective immediately for all applications being examined or patents being reexamined. Until all of the Office's automated systems are updated to reflect the revised statute, citation to the revised statute in Office actions is provided by this attachment. This attachment also substitutes for any citation of the text of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), if made, in the attached Office action.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of the AIPA and H.R. 2215 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in the attached Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the AIPA and H.R. 2215, applies to all qualifying references, except when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. For such patents, the prior art date is determined under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as it existed prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 102 prior to the amendment by the AIPA that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in the attached Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

For more information on revised 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) visit the USPTO website at www.uspto.gov or call the Office of Patent Legal Administration at (703) 305-1622.